28 April 1980

OGC Has Reviewed

MEMORANDUM FOR: All CRD Personnel

25X1A FROM   :

Chief, Classification Review Division

SUBJECT   : Manuscript Review

1. CRD recently reviewed a particularly troublesome manuscript submitted by a former employee. Several days of meetings ensued, during which the recommendations made concerning the manuscript by the Agency components involved were examined in exhaustive detail, reconciled where feasible, and in many instances abandoned. Representatives of the OGC (which had requested this decidedly unusual procedure), the DO, and the Agency Publications Review Board (PRB) participated in these sessions, as did the CRD reviewer (on behalf of the DA). (U)

2. This case was complicated by a lawsuit which the manuscript's author had previously filed to enjoin the Agency from "censoring" his book. Only after the Supreme Court decided the Snepp case in the Agency's favor did this author submit his own manuscript for review--preparing at the same time to present legal challenges to any and all deletions or revisions the Agency might demand. Hence OGC's participation in this particular review exercise. (U)

3. OGC takes the position that revision of manuscripts submitted for review should be confined to material which is <u>demonstrably classified or classifiable</u> under Executive Order 12065 and/or such legislation as the Atomic Energy Act of 1954. The National Security Act of 1947 and the CIA Act of 1949 exempt the Agency from making certain disclosures but, according to OGC, these exemptions are not applicable to information from former Agency employees. The categories of information defined in the two Acts were, in general terms, "grandfathered" into E.O. 12065 under Section 1-301(c) -- "intelligence activities, sources or methods" -- and are covered in considerable detail under the corresponding portion (paragraph 9c) of our own specific classification criteria ▮▮▮▮▮▮ Agency Information
25X1A Security Program Handbook). (U)

4. However, such criteria do not in themselves validate the classification of information. We must also determine whether there exists a reasonable expectation of "at least identifiable damage to the national security" (i.e., per E.O. 12065, to the "defense and foreign relations of the United States") if the information is disclosed. No identifiable damage, no classification or classificability. The Order (Section 1-303) and Handbook (paragraph 5c) make a <u>presumption</u> of such damage as regards disclosure of "foreign government information" (which includes
25X1A liaison information and is further defined in ▮▮▮▮ paragraph 9b) or of "the identity of a confidential foreign source" (interpretable as including, for example, a liaison service but usually meaning an individual, "warm body" source of HUMINT). (U)

DERIVATIVE CL BY __025650__
DECL REVW APRIL 2000
3 d (3)

5. According to OGC, the above presumptions can be invalidated by a showing that the information at issue is already in the public domain or even, perhaps, that the foreign government or other "confidential source" will not be affected by its disclosure. Here the "burden of proof" would seem to be on the author to make the case against any "identifiable damage", but once litigation has begun almost anything can happen. (U)

6. In the Marchetti case of some years back, the Agency was upheld by the trial court and Marchetti's book was published with blank spaces representing the deletions CIA had demanded. Marchetti appealed, however, and the appeals tribunal restored a number of the originally deleted items -- whereupon Marchetti published a new edition with those items printed in bold-face type. They were thus called emphatically to the reader's attention, making the situation worse from the Agency's standpoint than if those items had not been deleted in the first place. (U)

7. When a manuscript becomes an actual (or even potential) matter for litigation, authors can and will wrangle over every paragraph and sentence, even over individual words and phrases. It does the Agency little good, and indeed some harm in terms of wasted time and effort, to mark whole chapters and pages for deletion as did some of the reviewers (not CRD's) who processed the manuscript cited in the first paragraph above. Only rarely can the dele- tion of an entire paragraph be justified in terms of proving to a court of law that all of that paragraph's content is classifiable. Similarly, general statements about the classified nature of material in a manuscript are useful only to the extent that they may tell some other reviewing unit what to look for. That unit must then make the actual deletions (or other recommendations for removal of classified material) which the PRB can present to the author. (U)

25X1A   8. As noted ████████ (see attachment to this memo), the PRB has only 30 days from the date a manuscript comes in to return it to its author with all required revisions indicated. It is best, therefore, for the initial manuscript reviewers to do as complete a job as possible. CRD has the responsibility to review "for the DA with the exception of the Office of Security" and is thus (with this one exception) the final as well as the initial reviewing component for the DA. Parenthetically, the DO works differently. A manuscript may be sent to several Area Divisions, Staffs, etc. before DO/IMS conducts the final DO review based on the recommendations of other units. Of course, in our review we can and do call to the attention of other Agency components material which appears to be of interest to them. (U)

9. Unlike CRD's basic systematic review function, manuscript review is essentially a sanitization procedure which somewhat resembles our routine processing of Foreign Relations of the United States (FRUS) submissions from the State Department and the occasional Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) cases assigned to us. It differs from these, however, in that what appears in an employee's or ex-employee's unofficially published work does not constitute an official Agency disclosure. Agency approval for publication in no way endorses or validates the published material. (See paragraph 2b(9) of
25X1A ████████ although authors are not, of course, required to use the disclaimer which this provision of the regulation "encourages.") (U)

-2-

10. Accounts of positive intelligence, CI or CA operations as well as of other Agency activities in which employees or former employees were involved, or learned about during their Agency careers, frequently do contain classified or classifiable information even when the authors make some effort on their own to disguise or obfuscate the true facts. Even when manuscripts are billed as fiction the authors often fail, in our judgment, to conceal actual circumstances adequately. This can lead to identification of real intelligence sources and methods, or expose sensitive liaison relationships. It was William Colby's disclosures in his book Honorable Men (which was presented as fact) that led

25X1A to ▮▮▮▮▮ and the establishment of the present manuscript review procedures. The review of Honorable Men under the system formerly in effect failed to provide for adequate sanitization. (U)

11. Most ostensibly fictional works presented for review are cast in the traditional "spy story" mold pioneered by such authors as E. Phillips Oppenheim, Somerset Maugham (who once served as a British intelligence officer), Graham Greene, and numerous more recent exponents of the genre like Howard Hunt and even William F. Buckley. The degree to which Agency authors, whether present or former employees, preserve security by disguising actual people, places, and events in their stories obviously varies widely. In dealing with fictional works the reviewer must try to assess the extent to which the author's actual experience may be mirrored in the stories he tells. The reviewer must assume that authors will be identified in the book's jacket blurb or otherwise as "CIA operatives" or the like. Some details of their careers may also be published. Any such identification will clearly enhance an author's credibility and make the work seem authentic if not official and authoritative, requiring closer screening by us. If necessary, the reviewer can obtain information about the author's career in the Agency. (U)

12. Non-fiction about the Agency by former employees is normally published with mention of the author's CIA connection. Most manuscripts in this category are biographical -- usually autobiographical. Authors are discussing their own careers and grinding their own particular axes (some authors of fiction do this also, to be sure). Again it would prove useful to reviewers of non-fiction to be aware not only of the basic facts about the authors' careers but also, in the case of former employees, of their cover situation on leaving the Agency and what they were permitted to put in the unclassified job resumes and other material prepared for each departing employee. Review actions filtered through such basic information should be more realistic and supportable, thus providing a more professional review position. (U)

13. It clearly makes no sense to demand the deletion from manuscripts of information the authors have been allowed to disclose, or which has been disclosed on their behalf by the Agency itself (e.g., by the retirement elements of the Office of Personnel). Certain proposed revisions to the manuscript discussed in paragraph 1 above were prevented by such disclosures in that author's particular case. The nature of some of the work this author did overseas, moreover, had been disclosed by an earlier author who was also a former Agency employee. The fact that these data were already in the public domain prevented other proposed deletions from the subject manuscript. (U)

-3-

14. In the interests of saving time and effort, giving the PRB the best possible DA reviews of manuscripts, and thus generally ensuring maintenance of the same high standards in this area of our assigned responsibilities as in others, CRD's manuscript reviewers should:

a. Read through each manuscript at least once before marking anything in it for revision, to see what the author is about and to avoid messing up the manuscript only to find that a seemingly necessary deletion on page 27 is invalidated by material on page 532 (or even in an appendix, etc.). It is, of course, desirable to paperclip pages containing any apparently classified or classifiable items spotted during this initial reading, or to take separate notes thereon during the process.

b. Go through the manuscript again and mark on it the items which meet classification criteria (paragraphs 4-6 above). This will not normally involve whole pages or even paragraphs (though there will be occasional exceptions to this general principle). Rather, only those sentences, phrases or words which constitute the actual basis for classification should be marked. If -- as will often happen -- this results in portions of the manuscript looking like the proverbial "Swiss cheese," so be it. It is up to the author to determine whether to "edit around" Agency-required deletions or to publish a text full of holes, a la Marchetti. (NOTE: It is best to mark such items with a "yellow highlighter" which will not reproduce on copying machines. Errors made during the marking process can then easily be corrected: simply copy the relevant pages, make the corrections and substitute correct for incorrect pages. Manuscripts so marked look much "cleaner" than is the case when bracketing or underlining is used. To make bulky manuscripts or those requiring a great deal of marking-up easier to handle, they may be put into loose-leaf binders while being reviewed. Although this may involve a little extra work to punch the pages (they are sometimes already punched), it facilitates page-flipping and avoids making CRD look sloppy -- as we sometimes do when what goes back to PRB (or even to the author) is tattered or dog-eared. It is also useful to number the lines of text on manuscript pages marked for two or more revisions, which can then be easily identified when the review results are written up.)

c. Read the manuscript once more, for quality control. Make sure there is a valid classification basis for each deletion or other revision indicated. Such rechecking will also often pick up items missed earlier, or show that some previously marked revisions are actually unnecessary or should be amended.

d. Finally, write up the review results. Each deletion should be specifically identified. When several fall within a clearly definable and classifiable area (e.g., "information which could identify a covert agent" or the like), they may all be grouped under a statement to that effect. Do not, however, use such overly broad statements as "intelligence sources/methods/ activities" without specifying how the item selected for deletion relates substantively to the E.O. 12065 classification category. Most of the items we mark for deletion will be selected on the basis of intelligence sources, methods and activities for one reason or another; merely to "parrot" the classification category will convey no useful information to the PRB. It

-4-

should also be kept in mind that one type of classifiable data often found in manuscripts -- liaison relationships and activities -- fits better under the "foreign government information" provision of E.O. 12065 (Section 1-301b) than under the "...sources, methods..." provision (1-301c). The latter is sometimes over-used to cover anything and everything, when one of the others could more fittingly be cited in many instances. The "identifiable damage" criterion applies to all classification categories -- see paragraph 4 above. No deletion should be identified unless the reviewer can "reasonably expect" identifiable damage to occur if the manuscript is published with the original text unchanged. (U)

15. When reviewing manuscripts written by former Agency employees:

   Release: Mention of the existence of Agency Stations in countries where the author was assigned PCS under official or no cover. When personnel who served overseas under official cover are separated from the Agency in overt status, "opened up" as the phrase goes, it is clearly impractical to try to conceal the fact that they worked at Agency Stations during periods when they were on official tours of duty abroad. It is, of course, essential to ascertain whether the author's career was "opened up" upon separation from the Agency.

   Delete: The identity of Stations where the author served only TDY or at which he served ███████ or under non-official cover. Also delete information which identifies other Agency personnel serving at any Station, together with details of specific operations or other activities at any Station and data on any Station functions, organization, numbers of personnel, facilities, methods of operating, etc.

   Release: The mention of Headquarters organizational units at or above the Office level (Division level, in the DO) and also below that level when generic designations are used (e.g., "the ███████ which does not accurately name an actual component so designated but merely refers to a unit function).

   Delete: An actual Agency designation such as "the ███████████████

   Release: The names of other present or former Agency personnel who have authored previous publications and whose Agency connections were thereby disclosed. (NOTE: PRB is preparing a machine-records listing of such authors, the titles of their manuscript submissions and publications, and other data to serve as a "reference shelf" for future use by manuscript reviewers.)

   Release: The name and location of the Agency's ███████████ facility. This was among the disclosures Marchetti was ultimately allowed to publish and therefore cannot be deleted from the manuscripts of other authors. Keep in mind that the Marchetti incident does not constitute authorized executive disclosure; we continue to deny information about ███████ to FOIA requesters, and we do not declassify such information when encountered during systematic classification review. (C)

25X1A

25X1A

25X1A

25X1A

25X1A

25X1A

-5-

16. Many if not most of the above "do's and don'ts," along with a number of others, are already familiar in general terms to CRD reviewers. They are included primarily because they concern issues which arose during the final review sessions on the manuscript cited in paragraph 1, and may help to sharpen other reviewer's perceptions as they did those of the CRDer who took part in that review. (U)

25X1A

Attachment: Package under routing sheet entitled "Procedures for Submission of Manuscripts to the Publications Review Board (PRB)," enclosing memo- randum (same title) from Executive Secretary of the PRB," ▇▇▇▇▇ 25X1A
(cited above -- emphasis supplied) and Tabs A, B and C (explained in PRB/Exec's memo.)

25 September 1980

25X1A   MEMORANDUM FOR: ██████████
                            ITB/RMD/OIS

25X1A   VIA: ██████████
                          C/INTEL/CRD/OIS

25X1A   FROM: ██████████(C)
                          C/OPS/CRD/OIS

          SUBJECT: Request for a Printout from the DARE System (U)

1. We have a request for a printout from the DARE System of all the OSS entries which are entered under Job #79-00332A. It is requested that the run be made on the basis of characters 9 through 25 of the Document Identification Number section of the OSS 4023A form. Thus the printout will list entries by alphabetical and numerical order according to their "Unit," "Branch," "Category," "File Number," and "Folder or Document Number." See the attached copy of an OSS 4023A form for an example of the elements "b" through "f" of the Document Identification Number section which are to be used. Include full Subject Titles in the printout. (C)

2. Please deliver one copy of the printout to: ██████████   25X1A
25X1A   IMS,████████ Room 1 D 27 in Headquarters, Ext. 6865. Please deliver the second copy to C/CRD/OPS, 211 Key Bldg., Ext. 2777. (C)

3. Note that during the early stage of input to Job #79-00332A, some errors were made by using zeroes for the letter "O" and vice versa. Only the letter "O" should appear in character positions 9 through 17, i.e., for "Unit," "Branch," and "Category," and only zeroes in character positions 18 through 25, i.e., for "File Number," and "Folder or Document Number." Some of these errors were corrected but it is possible that not all of them were. If that is the case, would you also correct that situation before making the printout requested above. (C)

██████████   25X1A

Attachment: As Stated
Distribution:
   Original - Addressee w/att
   1 - CRD/ Intel
   1 - CRD/Ops ../att
   1 - Chrono

DERIVATIVE CL BY 063903
[ ] DECL [✓] REVW ON September 80
DERIVED FROM
                     79 c 5.2

Next 3 Page(s) In Document Exempt

(1) Classification:

The authority and need to classify material is unmanageable from a centralized recording system standpoint. The concept of tracking every classified document is impractical.

probably true

Not so — this is a listing of all authorized classifiers in RMD/RSB.

(2) Declassification:

The people with the authority to declassify documents not under their direct control is a limited number and well defined.

no better defined than is authority to classify (above).

yes, but ....

But anyone who classifies a document may also declassify that document. This makes the concept of a centralized system of recording and tracking every de-classified document impractical.

Not in my view — if we don't have to go too far into the past. W.

(3) Current Systems for recording declassified or released documents:

There are several systems in the Agency used to record data about declassified and/or released information.

All of these current systems were designed and built to fit a specific purpose and will not independently support an Agency-wide requirement without a major redesign and development effort.

See (attachment)

(4) Official release of information:

There are many (approximately 15) offices or individuals in the Agency who officially have authority to release information to the public. This adds complexity to the problem of identifying and recording the releases.

ILLEGIB

(5) Destruction of sanitized documents:

Documents which are sanitized and released to the public are considered temporary records and are destroyed at the end of five years.

Recommendation:

The sanitized version should be stored with and treated as an extension of the original document and subjected to the records schedule of that document. This would greatly reduce the possibility of different sanitized versions of the same document being released to the public.

The sanitization of a document may change with passage of time.

Previous attempts to identify the type of automated system needed to accomplish this objective have failed and with good reason. Before you can make these types of determinations you must first understand the game, identify the players and establish clear and precise rules. This has never been done.

OPTIONS:

In considering an automated system to help solve this problem there appears to be only four logical options.

(OPTION 1):

Continuation of the current efforts. We rely very heavily on experience, human memory, manual searches of files and the present automated systems (see attachment). This option is obviously not fulfilling our needs to the extent we desire. It is expensive in terms of manpower and inadequate for tracking previous releases of declassified material.

There is no Agency standard for manual or automated systems of recording and retrieving information on this subject. The components who have developed systems, both manual and automated, have tailored them for their own use. The systems are incompatible in both the information collected and the form in which it is stored.

(OPTION 2):

Modify one of the existing automated systems to accept the type and volume of information required to meet the Agency's needs for recording and retrieving this data. This option is addressing the automated systems which are being used currently (see attachment).

The concept is possible, but the desirability of doing this is very questionable and raises many difficult issues.

(1) Which system? The current systems were not intended to collect the type or volume of data which is needed when addressing the problem of Agency-wide release of declassified information. The software and possibly hardware modifications needed to accommodate this new requirement would be more costly than the original system design and development charges. The original purpose of this system must also be preserved to insure that it can be used to service the original requirement.

(2) Staffing and Budget. The new requirement, on one of the existing systems, if maintained and operated in its current component, would require increasing their staffing level. The responsibility of an Agency-wide system would mean developing procedures for users both for entering data and retrieving information from the system.

4

(3) Agency-wide focus. The component and system chosen would need to function in an environment free of component-oriented ideas and influences. This could cause friction and waste.

(4) Cost. The cost of a systems study and modifications which would be necessary would probably be as costly as developing a new system (see OPTION (4) COST).

(OPTION 5):

build a software link or interface to join the existing automated systems and allow a single request for information on any one system to automatically query all of the systems. This is the impossible dream. One reason for such a link never becoming a reality is first and foremost the cost. Building and maintaining the interface would be costly in terms of software and hardware. A second reason is the understandable desirability on the part of the DDO to restrict access to their automated systems. A third is that all of the existing systems are not on-line which means an automatic access would be currently impossible.

(OPTION 4):

Develop a new system specifically designed to capture, store, and retrieve this information. Centralize the control and management of this system in one component. Establish a clear definition of the types of data to be collected and the methods to be used for storing and retrieving information.

This option will also require the support of upper-level Agency management for a commitment of money and people, as well as Agency-wide guidance requiring all components to provide information to be stored in the system.

The cost of developing such a system would depend very much on the types of information required to effectively accomplish the task of tracking declassified and released documents. Experience tells us that even the simplest index system will be expensive to develop and maintain.

If you make the assumption that this option will be built using ODP analysts and existing facilities such as the ODP Standard Data Base Management Systems and terminals you can get some idea of what the planning and development might cost. The study would probably take one manyear and the development from six months to one year which could cost from 100,000 to 150,000 dollars. The yearly maintenance costs would depend on the type of system, number of requests, and volume of data involved. The greatest initial expense would be in going back and capturing all of the previously released information and again the cost is very difficult to estimate without some idea of the volume of data involved or the method which would be used to accomplish the task.

RECOMMENDATION:

In order to be able to recommend one of the options, management must answer the following questions:

(1) What is the ultimate goal? *To find out quickly how much into the been officially released on a given subject. JH*

(2) Is it worth doing? *yes*

(3) How much money, manpower, and time is it worth?

After these questions have been answered, if we are still interested in pursuing one of the options, then I would recommend that you build a new system, (OPTION 4).

Recap:

OPTION (1) -
   Continuation of current efforts:

   Inadequate and not meeting our current needs.

OPTION (2) -
   Modification of an existing automated system:

   Experience tells us that this approach is neither economical nor successful.

OPTION (3) -
   Software link:

   Not technically feasible at this time and if it were it would meet the most resistance.

OPTION (4) -
   Development of a new automated system:

   Allow a fresh unbiased look at an old problem.

The building of a new system is more than just developing hardware and software to handle data. The most critical decisions, especially in a system such as this one, will be:

(1) Do we have the complete understanding and concurrence of top Agency management and of those components which will be affected by the new system?

(2) Who will be responsible for the development, main-tenance, and daily operation of the new system? *OIS? JH*

6

(3) Establish a clearly defined objective and determine what information must be collected to accomplish that goal.

(4) Choose the most economical system available that will satisfy your objective. There are many options available and before one can be chosen with confidence, you must first have a good definition of its purpose.

The component responsible for capturing information about documents that have been declassified and released must be more than a place where others send paper because that is the rule. In order to make such a system work properly, this component should have prior knowledge of releases and the single releasing authority. The releasing authority would be no more than a signature which indicates that the information is now part of the system and not authority to evaluate the content of releases or the individual's right to release the information.

I further recommend that an analyst from the Office of Data Processing be assigned to evaluate the needs and make an informal recommendation on the type of automated system needed to store and retrieve this volume of information.

Biggest problems appear to be:

1. Identifying what information needs to be kept.
2. How to index it to meet the needs of the problem.

SYSTEM DESCRIPTIONS

The three automated systems described below are probably not the only automated systems or files which exist in the Agency and contain some information about declassified or released documents, but they are most certainly the major holdings.

DARE

The DARE system is used by the Classification Review Division of the Information Services Staff (CRD/ISS) to document the decisions made in the systematic review of permanent Agency records for declassification. CRD plans in the near future to store information on all declassified permanent records throughout the Agency as well as all classification extension determinations requiring DCI authorization. The future use of the DARE system as an on-line data base is also being considered.

The DARE system is a batch application written in PLI Programming Language and is processed on IBM 370's in headquarters room GC-03. The software and data are not compatible with the DECAL an PICDOC systems.

The DARE system is currently limited to data which has undergone systematic review and will soon contain all (permanent) documents reviewed to date.

The data base meets the requirements of CRD, but even with the addition of the new data will fall short of recording all declassified documents. This data base was not designed to address the problem of released documents. *nor does it have a retrieval capability by subject or keyword.* AH

DECAL

The DECAL system is used by the Information and Privacy Division of the Information Services Staff (IPD/ISS) to store a brief index of documents of general interest which have been declassified or sanitized and released to the public.

The DECAL software programs are run in the GC-03 computer center on the Interim Safe System. The software is called Aegis and is a unique software package developed and maintained by NFAC/OCR. The data is indexed to allow retrieval by several different search fields and key words.

The DECAL data is limited and does not contain all declassified or sanitized documents, only those deemed of general interest and, up until 1977, only documents which were released as a result of mandatory review were entered into DECAL. The system currently contains some 2,500 records which is an indicator of its limited scope.

The system, although not adequate to solve the problem of recording all declassified or desanitized documents released to the public, is fulfilling the current needs of IPD.

The DECAL system and the data stored in the system are not compatible with "DARE", the other ISS system which is used to store information about declassified documents or PICDOC, the DO data base used for the same purpose.

PICDOC

The PICDOC system is used by the DDO to retrieve documents that have been previously released in whole or in part under FOIA, PA, E.O. 12065, and non-disclosure litigations. The data base consists of three off-line files and is processed using the NIPS software and is run on the IBM 370 system in headquarters room GC-47. This data base currently has 50,000 records and by the end of FY 80 will contain 125,000 records.

The software system and the data are not compatible with the DARE or DECAL systems and although the PICDOC system serves the purposes of the DO, it falls far short of meeting the needs of the Agency for tracking all declassified and released documents.

Exactly what we want to capture is hard to express, as Stan has already noted. I have a few general ideas. I am convinced that it will have to be retrievable by subject or key word (and it may be an on-line system). I agree on the necessity of such a system. For starters, we could capture from FRUS volumes, manuscripts we have reviewed, IPD cases, DCI speeches, official press releases, and selected jobs reviewed by CRD that would be of public interest. OIS would be the logical component to handle this — maybe a 5th division.

2.0 Requirements

This section identifies the minimal, highly desirable, and desirable requirements necessary to support the typing workload. The system configuration (standalone single station, standalone clustered stations with shared printer, shared logic system system, or central online access) should be described in full detail.

The Word Processing Requirements Checklist (Attachment A) may be used to indicate editing, storage, printing, and interface requirements. Additional requirements and clarification may also be included.

3.0 Alternative Solutions

It is now possible to determine the suitable technology (magnetic card, video display, or central services), given the stated requirements and problems. A statement of the above technologies should describe the apparent shortfalls and prominent features in meeting the customer's needs.

Upon determination of the appropiate technology, Agency approved equipment can then be evaluated. A statement of each system considered should include: order of preference, advantages and disadvantages, potential in meeting requirements and alleviating problems, expected benefits, and estimated savings.

4.0 Cost Analysis

The cost analysis when considering word processing equipment is performed in two (2) steps: by determining the annual typing workload, and by determining the estimated annual personnel and machine cost. The cost analysis is required by GSA legisation (Bulletin B-36) for the installation of each piece of word processing equipment.

4.1 Annual Typing Workload

An inspection of the current workload is required to estimate the overall annual typing workload. Statistics are gathered for each component's major typing category (see Section 1.2) and recorded onto the Annual Typing Workload Form (Attachment B). Data may be collected in several ways including:

    a. Interviews - This method should be considered for small (1 to 3 stations) where the typists can provide reasonable estimates.

    b. Inspections - This method should be considered for small to medium (1 to 5 stations) where the typists cannot provide reasonable

- 2 -

Word Processing Feasibility Study
(Suggested Format)

1.0 Introduction

The introduction describes the background of the request and should address the following items: requesting office, organizational components being investigated, reason study is being performed, previous studies conducted, and study team members.

1.1 Missions and Objectives

The missions and objectives stated should be related to word processing activities. A brief description of the types of documents along with a statement of office policy relating to the preparation, review, and distribution should be included.

1.2 Typing Task Descriptions

The typing workload should be grouped into major categories (correspondence, forms, charts, statistics, reports, regulations, and etc.) for reporting purposes. A detailed description of each category should be provided and include the following items: average number of pages per document, average number of retypes per document, reviewing and editing procedures, timeliness of output, and other unique characteristics. Sample output copies may be provided for inspection as necessary for clarification.

1.3 Current System

This section should describe how the current workload is being accomplished. The number, type, and location of present workstations should also be included. In addition, the following items: inter and intra office coordination and communication requirements, special security considerations, availability and use of "borrowed equipment", and special clerical/typists skills.

1.4 Problems

This section should provide precise problem definition for which the proposed solution is to alleviate. The problem areas may include: increased and/or new workload, excessive overtime, backlogs of work, unacceptable quality of output, poor turnaround time, excessive amount of retyping, inability to perform required changes, and expected reduction in clerical force. Sample documentation may be provided to illustrate problem areas.

estimates but where an inspection of the
office's chronological files represent a
reasonable account.

c. Typing Logs - This method should be used
where neither of the above methods are
deemed suitable or where an accurate
accounting is desired. Data samplings may
be collected during a 1 to 2 week period and
projected into a yearly estimate. The Typ-
ing Log Worksheets (Attachment C) may be
used to record the necessary data for deter-
mining the annual typing workload.

4.2 Personnel and Machine Cost

This section is used to project the estimated resource
requirements (personnel and machine) and provides the basis
for justifying word processing equipment. A cost analysis
of the current system and each viable alternative solution
should be included for cost comparison purposes. The Word
Processing Cost Analysis Form (Attachment D) may be used to
determine the overall cost effectiveness. The formulas have
been derived from the National Archives and Records Service
(NARS) handbook and modified for Agency needs. NARS is the
GSA consultant for all government agencies for the develop-
ment of procedures for conducting word processing feasibil-
ity studies.

- 3 -

Word Processing Requirements Checklist

Please indicate the following requirements:

R - Required   D - Desirable
HD - Highly Desirable   NA - Not Applicable

(choose one)

	(R)	(HD)	(D)	(NA)

1. System Configuration

Standalone
Single Station w/printer. _____ terminals
Dual Station w/shared printer. _____ terminals

Shared Logic.   _____ terminals
                                 _____ printers

Online Central Facility.   _____ terminals
Other (please specify) _____

2. Text Editing

Adjustable Margins
Automatic Centering
Automatic Footnoting
Automatic Formatting
Automatic Hyphenation
Automatic Outlining
Automatic Pagination
Automatic Underlining
Automatic Widow/Orphan Control
Automatic Word Wraparound
Block Text Copy
Character Insert/Delete
Column Insert/Delete/Move
Document Oriented (docs 4 pages or more)
Global Search
Global Search with Replace
Horizontal Scrolling. _____ chars per line
Line Insert/Delete/Move
Multiple Headers and Trailers. _____ levels
Page Oriented (docs 4 pages or less)
Paragraph Insert/Delete/Move
Phrase Dictionary
Recorded Tabsettings
Flush Left
Flush Right
Decimal
Dot Leadering
Skip to Given Page

Attachment A   A-1   Attachment A

Word Processing Requirements Checklist

Please indicate the following requirements:

R - Required   D - Desirable
HD - Highly Desirable   NA - Not Applicable

(choose one)

Text Editing (cont.)

	(R)	(HD)	(D)	(NA)
Skip to Given Text				
Vertical Scrolling. _____ pages				
Word Insert/Delete				
Other (please specify)				
_____				
_____				
_____				
_____				

3. Software Options

	(R)	(HD)	(D)	(NA)
Automatic Glossary Index				
Automatic Table of Contents				
Compute Sub and Final Totals				
Display Scientific Equation Symbols				
Forms Fill-In and Print				
Index/Glossary of Stored Documents				
Merge Stored "boiler plate" Data				
Merge Keyboarded Text with Stored Data				
Perform Basic Row/Column Mathematical Operations				
Perform Records Management Functions (file definition, select, and sort)				
Store/Retrieve Previously Stored Data				
User Prompt Driven				
Other (please specify)				
_____				
_____				
_____				
_____				

4. Storage and Recording

	(R)	(HD)	(D)	(NA)
Single Diskette				
Dual Diskette				
Magnetic Card				
Magnetic Tape				
VM/CMS Mini Disk				
Other (please specify)				
_____				
_____				
_____				
_____				

Attachment A   A-2   Attachment A

Word Processing Requirements Checklist

Please indicate the following requirements:

R - Required   D - Desirable
HD - Highly Desirable   NA - Not Applicable

(choose one)

	(R)	(HD)	(D)	(NA)

5. Printing

	(R)	(HD)	(D)	(NA)
Local High Quality. _____ carbons				
Background Printing Mode	___	___	___	___
Multiple Character Sets per Pass. _____ sets	___	___	___	___
Type Fonts (specify: _____)	___	___	___	___
Character Pitch (specify: _____)	___	___	___	___
Print Queue. _____ documents	___	___	___	___
Proportional Printing for Flush Right Margins	___	___	___	___
Variable Spacing for Super and Subscripts	___	___	___	___
Other (please specify) _____	___	___	___	___
_____	___	___	___	___
_____	___	___	___	___
_____	___	___	___	___
_____	___	___	___	___

6. Interface

	(R)	(HD)	(D)	(NA)
ODP's VM/CMS Facility				
OC's Cable Dissemination System (CDS)	___	___	___	___
OL's Computer Output Microform (COM)	___	___	___	___
OL's Electronic Text Editing and Composing System (ETECS)	___	___	___	___
ODP's Online IBM System 6670 Printer	___	___	___	___
ODP's Online Xerox 9700 Printer	___	___	___	___
Other (please specify) _____	___	___	___	___
_____	___	___	___	___
_____	___	___	___	___
_____	___	___	___	___
_____	___	___	___	___

Attachment A   A-3   Attachment A

Word Processing Requirements Checklist

Glossary of Terms

ADJUSTABLE MARGINS - The ability to perform margin changes by a
single command, automatically changing line endings without
further intervention.

ARITHMETIC/MATHEMATICAL OPERATIONS - The ability of a word pro-
cessing system to be used as a calculator or adding machine.
Some systems have the ability to compute sub and final
totals and to perform basic row and column operations.

AUTOMATIC CENTERING - The ability to automatically center a word
or text segment between margins or on some some systems bet-
ween tab settings for centering column headings.

AUTOMATIC FOOTNOTING - The ability to tie footnotes to appropiate
text segments. If the text segment is moved to another page
or document, the footnote will travel with it.

AUTOMATIC FORMATTING - The ability to automatically align data in
a pre-determined format, between left and right margins, or
on tabset boundaries.

AUTOMATIC GLOSSARY INDEX - The ability to identify words or
phrases which are to appear as an index along with page num-
bers following the printed documents.

AUTOMATIC HYPHENATION - The ability to perform line ending deci-
sions and to insert super imposed breaks in long or compli-
cated words at input time and during document format-
ting/reformatting time.

AUTOMATIC OUTLINING - The ability to define up to six (6) levels
of indentation with automatic formatting and numbering of
textual data.

AUTOMATIC PAGINATION - The ability to take a multi-page document
and divide it into pages of a specified length (in number of
lines) and to automatically generate page numbers.

AUTOMATIC TABLE of CONTENTS - The ability to identify words or
phrases which are to appear along with page numbers in a
directory preceeding the printed document.

AUTOMATIC UNDERLINING - The ability to indicate the beginning and
ending of an underline by a code, rather than backspacing
and underlining on a character-by-character basis.

Attachment A   A-4   Attachment A

AUTOMATIC WIDOW/ORPHAN CONTROL - The ability of a word processor
to automatically prevent the first line of a paragraph, or a
title or heading, from printing on the last line of a page.
The system also prevents a last line from being the first
line of a new page.

AUTOMATIC WORD WRAPAROUND - The ability of a word processor to
automatically place a word which does not fit onto the line
being typed onto the next line without the operator having
to depress a "return" key.

BACKGROUND PRINTING - The automatic execution of a print function
simultaneous to the keyboarding or editing of another docu-
ment.

BLOCK TEXT COPY - The ability to designate a block of text, and
to move it within the document or to another document.

CHARACTER PITCH - Horizontal character spacing at 10, 12 or 15
characters per inch.

COLUMN INSERT/DELETE/MOVE - The ability to designate a column of
data and to delete, or move that block of text. Additional
columns of data can be inserted into the pre-determined
text.

DECIMAL ALIGNMENT - The ability to align columns of decimal fig-
ures on the decimal point.

DELETE/INSERT/MOVE - The ability to delete, insert and move char-
acters, words, lines, sentences, paragraphs and blocks of
text.

DOCUMENT ORIENTED SYSTEM - The ability to process a multi-page
document and divide it into pages of a specified length at
printing time. This system is usually suitable for docu-
ments of four (4) pages or more in length.

DOT LEADERING - The ability fo fill unused left or right posi-
tions with a defined character, usually a dot. This is usu-
ally used for a table of contents.

DUAL STATION - A word processor configuration usually made up of
two keyboards or video displays, two mag card/tape readers
or diskettes, and one printer.

FLUSH LEFT - A term that describes a block of text that has an
evenly justified left margin.

FLUSH RIGHT - A term that describes a block of text that has an
evenly justified right margin.

FORMS FILL-IN and PRINT - The ability to record data onto a pre-printed form by spacing automatically from one field to another.

GLOBAL SEARCH - The ability of a system to search for repeated occurences of a character string.

GLOBAL SEARCH and REPLACE - The ability of a system to search for repeated occurrences of a character string and automatically delete all occurrences or replace all occurrences with another string.

HORIZONTAL SCROLLING - The ability of a display-based system to move horizontally along a line of text to access more characters than may be shown on the screen at one time.

INDEX - A list of documents contained on a unit of storage media (e.g., a diskette).

MERGE - A word processing feature by which a system can assemble new documents from previously recorded text. Most systems can combine prerecorded text with keyboarded text.

MULTIPLE HEADERS and TRAILERS - The ability to place multiple lines of text at the top and bottom of each page of a multi-page document.

ONLINE CENTRAL FACILITY - A word or data processing operation which is performed on a local system connected to and sharing the facilities of a remote central processor.

PAGE ORIENTED SYSTEM - The lack of the ability to automatically divide a multi-page document into pages of a specified length. Each page must be controlled by the operator. This system is used generally for documents of four (4) pages or less.

PHRASE DICTIONARY - The ability to define abbreviated codes which can be expanded into clear text: e.g.; ODP expanded to Office of Data Processing.

PRINT FONT - A character set in a particular style and size of type, including all alpha characters, numbers, punctuation marks and special symbols.

PRINT QUEUE - A feature which allows for a number of documents to be lined up for subsequent printout while the operator goes on to perform other tasks.

PROPORTIONAL SPACING - Typed, printed, or displayed text where each alphanumeric character is given a weighted amount of space. For instance, an "I" might be two units wide, an "L" four units wide and a "W" five units wide.

RECORDS MANAGEMENT - The ability of a word processing system to create files of information which may be manipulated, selected, sorted, and reported from massaged fields of data.

SHARED LOGIC - A multi-terminal system where each terminal shares the word processing power, storage and peripherals of a central computer.

SINGLE STATION - A word processor configuration usually made up of a keyboard, or video display, mag card/tape reader or diskette, and a printer.

SKIP - The ability to locate text by a specified page or character string.

STANDALONE - A word processor such as a mag keyboard or video display system which does not share the processing power of a central computer.

USER PROMPTS - A reminder(s) usually implemented via display that assists the word processing operator in performing a function.

VERTICAL SCROLLING - The ability to move vertically, one line at a time, up and down through one or more pages of text.

VERTICAL SPACING - The ability of a word processing system to print or display in increments of spacing for functions such as super and subscripts.

Attachment A   A-7   Attachment A

Estimated Annual Typing Workload

Name: _____   Ext: _____   Date: _____

Off/Div: _____

(please specify category of typing task)

Data Elements	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)
1. Documents per year					
2. Pages per document					
3. Lines per page					
4. Retypes per document					
5. Lines changed per page					
6. Original pages per year (line 1 x line 2)					
7. Original lines per year (line 6 x line 3)					
8. Revised pages per year (line 6 x line 4)					
9. Revised lines per year (line 8 x line 5)					
10. Total lines per year ((line 6 + line 8) x line 3)					
11. Original/Revised lines per year (line 7 + line 9)					
12. Repetitive lines per year (line 10 - line 11)					

Attachment B

B-1

Attachment B

Estimated Annual Typing Workload

Instructions

An Estimated Annual Typing Workload Form should be prepared for each component being investigated. Background data gathered for each component (see Section 4.1) is recorded onto lines 1 - 5 and is used to compute the projected annual workload in lines 6 - 12. The original/revised lines (line 11) and repetitive lines (line 12) are the basis for determining the cost effectiveness of a word processing solution per component.

Data relating to each major category is recorded as follows:

Line 1- Enter the number of finished documents produced per year. Ensure that those less frequently produced documents are included.

Line 2- Enter the average number of pages per document.

Line 3- Enter the average number of lines per page.

Line 4- Enter the average number of retypes per document.

Line 5- Enter the average number of lines containing at least one change per retype.

Line 6- Compute the number of finished pages per year.
            (line 1 times line 2)

Line 7- Compute the number of finished lines per year.
            (line 6 times line 3)

Line 8- Compute the number of revised pages per year.
            (line 6 times line 4)

Line 9 - Compute the number of revised lines per year.
            (line 8 times line 5)

Line 10- Compute the total lines typed per year.
            ((line 6 plus line 8) times line 3)

Line 11- Compute the total original/revised lines per year.
            (line 7 plus line 9)

Line 12- Compute the total repetitive lines per year.
            (line 10 minus line 11)

Note: The sum of lines 11 and 12 (a - e) are used to determine the cost effectiveness (see Attachment D) of word processing solution(s).

Attachment B   B-2   Attachment B

Daily Typing Log

Name: _____   Ext: _____   Date: _____
Off/Div : _____

Task No.	Specify Report Category	Number Typed Lines	Repetitive/Revised			Time Mins	Equipment	
			Chgd	Unchgd	Min/Maj		Type	Loc
1.								
2.								
3.								
4.								
5.								
6.								
7.								
8.								
9.								
10.								
11.								
12.								
13.								
14.								
15.								
16.								
17.								
18.								
19.								
20.								

Attachment C   C-1   Attachment C

Daily Typing Log

Instructions

This data collection instrument is used to record the typing workload in each major typing category. Data collection is usually conducted over a two week period supplemented by estimates of those tasks not performed during the collection period. The overall typing workload for the office is computed using the recorded data and posted on the typing task workload data collection instrument as described in Attachment B.

1. <u>Name</u>. Enter your name, office, extension, and date for contact purposes.

2. <u>Task No</u>. Record an entry for each typing task.

3. <u>Report Category</u>. Enter the category of the typing task as instructed by your office representative.

4. <u>Typed Lines</u>. Enter the total number of lines for each task.

5. <u>Repetitive/Revised with Minor/Major Changes</u>. Enter the total number of lines (changed and unchanged) for each task which is being typed for other than the first time.

Enter the type of revisions;

minor - if changes are made to words, punctuation, and/or sentences and are limited to one or two lines;

major - if changes are made to paragraphs, sections, and/or blocks of text and affect more than two lines or span to the next page.

6. <u>Time</u>. Record the total typing and play-out time (in minutes) for each task.

7. <u>Equipment Used</u>. Specify the type of equipment; selectric typewriter, self-correcting typewriter, Mag Card, Vydec, etc. and its location.

Attachment C   C-2   Attachment C

Estimated Annual Personnel Machine/Cost

Name: _____   Ext: _____   Date: _____

Off/Div : _____

	rate	hrs	rate	hrs	rate	hrs
1. Annual Typing Hours Required:						
a. Orig/Rev Lines: _____						
b. Repetitive Lines: _____						
Total Annual Typing Hours						
(lines / rate = hours)						
2. Personnel Required						
(hours / 1,540 = persons)						
3. Personnel Cost						
((salary + 10%) x persons = cost)						
4. Machine Cost (purchase price amortized over 5 years.)						
Specify type, # units, and cost:						
_____						
_____						
_____						
_____						
_____						
_____						
5. Personnel and Machine Costs						
(line 4 + line 5)						
6. Estimeted Cost Savings						
(current - proposed)						

Attachment D   D-1   Attachment D

Estimated Annual Personnel Machine/Cost

Instructions

The Estimated Annual Personnel and Machine Cost Form should be completed for each component being investigated. Data derived from the Estimated Annual Typing Workload Form (Attachment B) is used to determine the cost effectiveness of word processing equipment for each component. An analysis of the current system and each viable solution (Section 3.0) should be prepared for cost comparison purposes.

Line 1 - Annual typing hours required. The annual typing hours is computed by: (1) dividing the number of original/revised lines by the hourly productivity rate, (2) dividing the number of repetitive lines by the hourly productivity rate, and (3) adding the total original/revised and repetitive hours. The following hourly productivity rates represent an average workload with light to medium revisions. These rates may vary depending of the type of equipment used and the nature of the typing workload.

	ETW	Mag Card	Video Display
Original/Revised	188	153	166
Repetitive	236	327	621

Line 2 - Personnel required. The annual typing hours required (line 1) is divided by 1,540 to determine the number of full-time positions. Approximately 1,540 hours are available for productive work per full-time position.

Line 3 - Personnel cost. The average typist salary (plus 10 for overhead) is multiplied by the number of personnel required (line 2).

Line 4 - Machine cost. The machine cost represents the average purchase price per unit amortized over a five (5) year period. The following prices may be used for costing purposes:

	Purchase	Amortized
CPT 8000T	$ 22,000	$ 4,400
Electric Typewriters	800	160
IBM Mag Cards	8,000	1,600
Lanier LTE-3	12,000	2,400
Lexitron VT1303	24,000	4,800
NBI 3000 dual station	19,400	3,880
NBI 3000 single station	13,900	2,780
Vydec 1400-15	18,000	3,600

Attachment D   D-2   Attachment D

Estimated Annual Personnel Machine/Cost

The piece of equipment, amortized cost, and number of units required should be included on the form.

<u>Line 5</u> - Total personnel and machine cost. Sum of lines 3 and 4.

<u>Line 6</u> - Estimated cost savings. Cost of current system minus the cost of the proposed solution.

Attachment D   D-3   Attachment D

computer input

A/examplex format which might be used to record and retrieve components' initial deletion recommendations as well as the above "final" PRB actions and other relevant data (see attached "Manuscript Review Worksheet" and appended explanation) has been developed by CRD and is under study by RMD/ITB. The latter's preliminary assessment indicates that the format could be applied through an on-line GIMS system in conjunction with the new Delta Data terminals now available, which have a built-in word processing capability; this would substantially speed up the reconciliation and editing of deletion recommendations while also permitting, when desired, direct input to the system of the data to be recorded concerning each manuscript or other text reviewed. The same format could also be used with a batch-mode VM system, but this application would be considerably slower and less flexible without providing any significant cost advantage.

UNIFORM MANUSCRIPT REVIEW
PROCEDURES PROJECT

1 August 1980

Background

1. A manuscript review exercise in March and early April 1980 (the ███████ case) STATINTL
requir ed extensive and time-consuming consultation among OGC, DO/IMS, CRD(for the
DDA) and the PRB to reconcile the widely varying deletion recommendations made by
the Agency components participating in the review pursuant to █████ The exercise STATINTL
demonstrated a need for much greater uniformity and consistency in the criteria and
standards applied to such reviews as well as in the presentation of review results
to the PRB.

2. Following resolution of this case, C/ISS asked CRD to come up with proposals for
achieving the above desiderata. We have been working on the matter ever since, to
the extent allowed by the pressure of other tasks and the accessibility of data on
STATINTL how other components. perform their reviews. A current case which rather resembles
███████ nvolves the manuscript submitted for review by ████████████ The PRB STATINTL
is understood to have decided on 29 July what material this author will be asked to
delete, but the final outcome remains uncertain pending his reactions and those of his
ACLU attorney -- the same one who represented █████ Problems may well ensue if STATINTL
STATINTL ███████ is required to delete material essentially similar to what ███████ was per- STATINTL
mitted to publish; similar considerations apply to other manuscripts submitted.

3. It seems worth noting that a Senate Select Committee investigation of the manus-
cript review process is now underway, as announced by Mr. Hetu at his Weekly In-house
News Conference on 29 July. Among other matters, the Committee will apparently look into
allegations of Agency "discrimination" among authors whereby some (especially former
high officials) have been allowed to publish material denied to lesser lights.

Actions to Date

4. On 28 April, C/CRD issued a memorandum of instruction (copy attached) for internal CRD use. Portions of this instruction may ultimately prove adaptable for application by other Agency components conducting manuscript reviews. Our aim is to produce a set of comprehensible and unambiguous guidelines, acceptable to all such components, which would specify not only the criteria and standards to be used in reviewing manuscripts but also the manner in which they are to be applied and the way in which review results would be recorded and presented for the PRB's consideration. In addition, suggestions for permanent registration of each review's final outcome -- for ready reference as "precedent" in an accessible and convenient data base -- would also be made.

5. On 29 July, a suggested computer format intended for adaptation both to each component's initial review recommendations and to the above "final" registration was informally presented to RMD/ITB for a preliminary assessment of technical feasibility. See attached "MANUSCRIPT REVIEW WORKSHEET" and appended explanatory material.

6. Concurrently, we have tried with some success (but not enough -- see below) to
other
obtain from/reviewing components like DO/IMS and CSS, as well as from the PRB itself, a continuing inflow of data on those components' and the PRB's review standards, criteria and procedures whereby review results are presented and recorded. Such "feedback" seems essential to the assignment of preparing useful and realistic proposals for improvement of the review process. CRD regularly send copies of its own review recommendations to DO/IMS (a majority of the items we have reviewed recently seem to involve DO equities) and when appropriate to such other components as NFAC, etc. Seldom or never, however, does CRD receive equivalent data from others. We have received nothing from the PRB for some two months now.

Present Needs

7. In order to make further progress toward preparation of the desired guidelines and procedures designed to lessen the burden of manuscript reviews on the components involved as well as on the PRB while making it feasible to conduct these reviews more rapidly, accurately and consistently than at present within the mandatory 30-day time frame allotted for responses to authors, CRD now needs:

25X1A   a. Access to PRB records concerning past and current (e.g., the ▮▮▮▮ case) review including the final outcome (when known) of each; at a minimum, we would like to study
25X1A   PRB's data on cases subsequent to the ▮▮▮▮ exercise as well as the final results of the latter.

b. Data (including the system's "menu") on the ADP system now used or scheduled for use in the near future by the PRB to keep track of its manuscript review processing.

c. PRB member components' cooperation in consultations and information-exchanges (which need not be overly formal) at the working level and up concerning the review
25X1A   process within each component, as well as with OGC (▮▮▮▮▮ et al.) concerning the "case law" and other precedents affecting the process.

8. In view of the Senate Select Committee's investigation cited above, it would probably also be desirable for CRD at least to survey the material being made available to
for our
the Committee through PRB and or OLC; it would seem essential/~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ propo-
to be
sed guidelines and procedures/~~xxx~~ so framed as to ensure nondiscriminatory applicability to all authors' manuscripts, among other things. We would also want them to be fully consistent with the Agency position vis-a-vis the Committee, of course.

MANUSCRIPT REVIEW WORKSHEET

1 PRB # ☐☐☐ - ☐☐ - ☐☐☐ — **2 #PAGES** ☐☐☐ **3 HRS** ☐☐ **4 DATE** ☐☐☐☐☐☐ (DD MM YY) **5 SHEET #** ☐☐

6 COMPONENT CODE ☐☐☐ **7 REVIEWER EMPLOYEE #** ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐ **8 SHEET PAGES** ☐☐☐

9 AUTHOR ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐ **10 TITLE** ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐

11 ☐ NO ☐ CLASSIFIED OR CLASSIFIABLE MATERIAL (E.O. 12065, SCTNS 1-301/302) REQUIRING DELETION: / ███████ (PARA 9)

12 PAGE(S) **13 LINE(S)** **14 TEXT ITEM(S) TO BE DELETED**

| FM ☐☐☐ | FM ☐☐ | FM ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐ | | A B C D E F G |
| TO ☐☐☐ | TO ☐☐ | TO ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐ | | |

| FM ☐☐☐ | FM ☐☐ | FM ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐ | | A B C D E F G |
| TO ☐☐☐ | TO ☐☐ | TO ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐ | | |

| FM ☐☐☐ | FM ☐☐ | FM ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐ | | A B C D E F G |
| TO ☐☐☐ | TO ☐☐ | TO ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐ | | |

| FM ☐☐☐ | FM ☐☐ | FM ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐ | | A B C D E F G |
| TO ☐☐☐ | TO ☐☐ | TO ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐ | | |

| FM ☐☐☐ | FM ☐☐ | FM ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐ | | A B C D E F G |
| TO ☐☐☐ | TO ☐☐ | TO ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐ | | |

| FM ☐☐☐ | FM ☐☐ | FM ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐ | | A B C D E F G |
| TO ☐☐☐ | TO ☐☐ | TO ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐ | | |

| FM ☐☐☐ | FM ☐☐ | FM ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐ | | A B C D E F G |
| TO ☐☐☐ | TO ☐☐ | TO ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐ | | |

| FM ☐☐☐ | FM ☐☐ | FM ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐ | | A B C D E F G |
| TO ☐☐☐ | TO ☐☐ | TO ☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐ | | |

STATINTL

SUGGESTED "MANUSCRIPT REVIEW WORKSHEET" COMPUTER INPUT FORM

A. This form would feed a ▓ program to allow recording and retrieval of the reviews coducted by various Agency components of manuscripts and other texts submitted for review to the Agency Publications Review Board (PRB) by present and former employ- ees in accordance with ▓▓▓▓▓▓

STATINTL

B. Each component reviewing such a manuscript or other text would enter the results on the form, using as many sheets as necessary to capture all the data to be recorded, as per the accompanying instructions; the PRB itself would register the final results of the various reviews by other components (which would, however, be kept separate in the computer so that they could be compared) after they are reconciled, and would also register the ultimate outcome -- i.e., a record would be kept of the entire process concerning each manuscript as well as of the deletions from its original texts accepted by the author after any negotiations with the PRB and/or ensuing lawsuits, etc. which might develop (in the latter case, "acceptances" would be made by the courts, of course).

C. The following explanations/instructions are keyed to the "footnote" numbers on this suggested form:

1. The "PRB #" is the number PRB assigns to each manuscript.

2. "# PAGES" means the total number of pages comprising the manuscript or other text.

3. "HRS" means the total number of hours spent of the review by the component con- cerned.

4. The date is the date when the review is completed.

5. The "SHEET #" (001, 002...) is the number of the particular worksheet used to cover the manuscript or any portion of it; the number of sheets used will depend on the number and location of the textual items recommended for deletion from each manuscript.

6. The "COMPONENT CODE" would be a three-digit number specifying the particular compo- nent or (e.g., in the DO) ▓▓ subcomponent such as an Area Desk or other element reviewing the manuscript.

7. This is the six-digit Agency Employee Number of the individual reviewing officer.

8. "SHEET PAGES" registers the number of the last page covered by each worksheet (see footnote 5 above), and may or may not be the same as the last page number entered on the last line of the sheet (see footnote 12 below). It may be a higher number, but may not be a lower one.

ILLEGIB

9. Enter here the author's name: Last name, middle/initial and first names -- to the extent that the number of characters (30) in the field will permit. (Thus, ▓▓▓▓▓ "Jonathan Wilberforce Throttlebottom" would be entered as: T H R O T T L E B O T T O M , J O N A T H A N W I L B E R F). The name must be written exactly as it appears on the manuscript, do not "convert" a spelled-out middle name into an initial, for instance.

ILLEGIB

10. Enter the title also exactly as presented except that an initial "A", "An" or "The" will be omitted. Thus, "The Price of Sturgeon in Lower Ubangistan" ▓▓▓▓▓▓ would appear as: P R I O F S T U R G E O N I N ..... etc.) most titles should fit into the 52 character allotted to this field; those that are too long will simply be chopped off where the field "runs out".

(but not both).

11. Check either box. If first is checked, manuscript or text is assessed as containing no classified material. If second is checked, it does contain such material and one or more deletions must be indicated below(see footnotes 12-15).

12. Enter page or pages on which manuscript's first item to be deleted appears, using "TO" field only if item begins on one page and ends on a subsequent one. Continue with second, third (etc.) pages containing such items up to a maximum of eight (because the sheet has space for no more). If additional deletions required, use additional sequentially-numbered sheets, each of which will begin with the first subsequent page containing one or more deletion items. (NOTE: The "SHEET PAGES" entry for each sheet will show ~~XXXXXX~~ the last page of the manuscript which precedes the next subsequent page bearing material to be deleted.)

13. Enter line on which deletion item begins in the "FROM" field, again using the "TO" field only if the item continues on a subsequent line or lines.

14. Enter the word (or words, if they fit within space provided) ~~xxxxxxxx~~ with which the passage to be deleted begins in the "FROM" field, entering the last word(s) of in the passage in the "TO" field. A single word (or short phrase fitting within the space available in the "FROM" field)will be entered only in that field. If the entries in either field neither begin nor end a sentence, they will be preceded and followed by three ~~xxxx~~ dashes (- - -) in the corresponding fields.

15. Enter an "X" or check-mark in the appropriate box(es) opposite each deletion item. These boxes (A/B/C/D/E/F/G) correspond to the 7 categories of classifiable information specified in Section 1-301 of E.O. 12065, and will thus register the classification justification basis for each deletion item. NOTE: When/if more specific justification is required, the boxes can be used to specify the precise category or categories provided in Paragraph 9 of ▮▮▮▮▮▮ which ~~xxxx~~ is an "expansion" of the Executive Order categories. To use this method, write the appropriate number of that category in the box under the corresponding letter -- the "C" category, which will be the one most frequently used, has a total of 13 categories; hence the double box allowing for two-digit entries. If this more specific justification procedure is not used, both boxes under "C" should be filled in ("X/X") when this justification applies.

STATINTL

STATINTL

STATINTL

STATINTL

SENDER WILL CHECK CLASSIFICATION TOP AND BOTTOM			
X UNCLASSIFIED		CONFIDENTIAL	SECRET

OFFICIAL ROUTING SLIP

TO	NAME AND ADDRESS	DATE	INITIALS
1	███████████████	5 May	J.C.K
2			
3	C/CRD	16 Mar 81	
4			
5			
6	███████████████		

ACTION	DIRECT REPLY	PREPARE REPLY	
APPROVAL	DISPATCH	RECOMMENDATION	
COMMENT	FILE	RETURN	
CONCURRENCE	INFORMATION	SIGNATURE	

Remarks: Attached is an outline guide for Conducting a word processing Survey as per our Telephone conversation. Sections 1 and 2 are required from the requesting office. Sections 3 and 4 may be completed by either the requesting office for our review or with our assistance. Currently we have approximately a 3 month backlog in conducting surveys. Therefore, the more ~~what~~ you can provide us initially will expedite your request when it comes up in the queue.

FOLD HERE TO RETURN TO SENDER	
FROM: NAME, ADDRESS AND PHONE NO.	DATE
██████████████ (X 8-8377)	3/4/81

X UNCLASSIFIED	CONFIDENTIAL	SECRET

FORM NO. 237 1-67   Use previous editions   ☆USGPO: 1976 — 202-953   (40)

MEMORANDUM FOR: C/CRD

Agree with others' marginal comments and have added a few (in blue, on third page of the "problem statement" just under the covering memo).

Have a gut feeling (or is it just a bellyache) that the "gnomes" are making this thing look a lot more complicated than it really is. Our proposed ▮▮▮▮ (now waiting only for word from OGC and NFAC, last I heard from RCD) goes part way toward meeting some of the problems, as noted in the section on the DARE system. Here as elsewhere, half a loaf (as long as not "half-baked") may well be better than no bread -- unless management will spring for the large amount of "bread" necessary to remodel all the existing sys-tems into a brand new one (per "Option 4" of the problem statement).

May I volunteer to help work on this (assuming CRD will will participate at all, of course) ? ▮▮▮▮▮

Date   2/9/80

FORM 101 USE PREVIOUS
5-75   EDITIONS

STATINTL

STATINTL

TRANSMITTAL SLIP   DATE

TO:
Chief, Classification Review Division

| ROOM NO. | BUILDING |
| 211 | Key |

REMARKS:

FYI

C/OPS
C/INT
C/ADM
C/S+T
Owen F.
C/CRD ___

*see notes on memo.

FULL
SPEED
AHEAD   Timely!
        Comments?

*I hope this won't take as long as I-66 to complete. [It could!]

FROM:
A/Director of Information Services

| ROOM NO. | BUILDING | EXTENSION |
| 5B2830 | HQS | 5117 |

FORM NO. 241   REPLACES FORM 36-8   (47)
1 FEB 55   WHICH MAY BE USED.

STATINTL

STATINTL

STATINTL

STATINTL

**MEMORANDUM
OF CALL**

TO:

[REDACTED]

☑ YOU WERE CALLED BY— ☐ YOU WERE VISITED BY—

[REDACTED]

OF (Organizat [REDACTED]

☐ PLEASE CALL → PHONE NO. CODE/EXT. 3438 ☐ FTS

☐ WILL CALL AGAIN ☐ IS WAITING TO SEE YOU

☑ RETURNED YOUR CALL ☐ WISHES AN APPOINTMENT

MESSAGE WORD PROCESSING RQMT.

[REDACTED] , ODP

Survey — Form 930
Statement of Rqmts.
Cost Justification
How system would interface
Backlog of 3-4 months.

RECEIVED BY _[signature]_ DATE 3-4 TIME 1058

63-109

STANDARD FORM 63 (Rev. 8-76)
Prescribed by GSA
FPMR (41 CFR) 101-11.6